



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*The Hymn to Bélit, K. 257 (HT. 126-131).*—By J. DYNELEY PRINCE, Professor in Columbia University, New York City.

THIS text, which is one of the most difficult of the Sumerian hymns, has, so far as I am aware, never been published before. Professor Haupt made his version of the inscription from a copy furnished him by Mr. Pinches, which Professor Haupt carefully compared with the original text written in Babylonian characters (see HT. 131). The version in HT. is given for the convenience of the student in Assyrian transliteration. The British Museum has several duplicates of K. 257; viz., K. 5122, K. 4968, and K. 4634 (see ZK. ii. 69). I regret that I have been unable to obtain copies of these texts, which might shed some additional light on the interpretation of the hymn. Similar texts are K. 2004 and the inscription published in *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*, Pt. xv, plates 24-25; see Pinches's remarks in PSBA., Nov. 12, '02, 307. The hymn reminds us also of Reisner's *Sumerian Hymns in the Berlin Museum* (in "Mitteil. aus d. oriental. Sammlungen," Teil 10, Berlin, 1896). The student should also compare Dr. Banks's Dissertation *Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen*, Leipzig, 1897.

The hymn K. 257 is important from two points of view. It presents a philologically interesting text in the *Eme-sal* dialect, whose existence and phonetic characteristics were first pointed out by Professor Haupt (*Nachr. d. kön. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Gött.*, 1880, 513-541 and HT. 133 ff.), and it affords a field for speculation with regard to its mythological concepts. Weissbach in his *Sumerische Frage*, 52 ff., however, mentions the names of some Assyriologists who suspected the presence of the *Eme-sal* dialect of Sumerian before Haupt definitely established the fact of its existence. In view of the peculiar character of this hymn and in spite of the difficulties under which I have labored because of my inability to procure copies of the duplicate texts, I venture to present a translation and philological exposition which may pave the way for future investigations in this inter-

esting field. I am indebted to Professor Haupt for valuable bibliographical material in connection with this inscription. Mr. S. H. Langdon has joined me during the past session at Columbia University in a special study of K. 257 and similar texts, and I owe to him several suggestions which have been duly mentioned in the following treatise.

It is now generally accepted that *Eme-sal* is the non-Semitic designation for a variation of the Sumerian language (cf. Hommel, *Semiten* i, 280; Weissbach, *op. cit.*, 175). These texts in variant form were called "Akkadian" by Hommel, Delitzsch, Zimmern, etc., and "Sumerian" by Haupt. It is unnecessary here to enter into the details of the Sumerian dialect question, which have been admirably set forth by Weissbach in his *Sum. Frage*, 55-61. The fact seems to be that in the non-Semitic texts *Eme-ku* means *Šumer*, i. e. Babylonia, another synonym for which is *Kingi*, which is given as the equivalent of *Šumer* especially, and of "land" in general, as they naturally regarded *Šumer* as the land *par excellence* (Br. 9662.). This application of *Eme-ku* is now definitely established by Bezold's discovery of the fragment 81-7-27, 130 (ZA. iv. 434), i. e. *eme-ku=li-ša-an Šu-me-ri* "the language of *Šumer*." There can be no doubt that *ku* in this combination was considered to be a distinctive designation, either racial or descriptive. This happy discovery makes it perfectly patent, moreover, that the Assyrians both knew and mentioned the Sumerian language. Owing to the undoubted distinction between *Eme-ku* and *Eme-sal*, I have used in this article the former term to denote the ordinary "classical" Sumerian (indicated by EK. and the *Eme-sal* by ES. in the following exposition). Weissbach (*op. cit.* 176/7), in order to connect the Assyrians' Sumerian language with the non-Semitic idiom which we know as Sumerian, points out that the word *Kingi*, as already indicated above, is synonymous with *Šumer*. The inhabitants of *Kingi=Šumer* were therefore "the Sumerians," and the language which belongs to *Kingi* was "Sumerian." Since, then, this *Kingi* always appears in the non-Semitic column of bilingual cuneiform inscriptions, we are justified in naming the idiom of this non-Semitic column "Sumerian." Thus far Weissbach.

Inasmuch as *ku* in the combination *Eme-ku=lišān Šumeri* has evidently a distinctive sense, either racial or characteristic, we

may assume that *sal* in *Eme-sal* had a similar signification. The whole difficulty lies in the correct interpretation of *ku* and *sal*, for neither of which terms can we find a satisfactory racial or geographical sense. *Ku* has a number of more or less exalted Assyrian equivalents, such as *bēlu* "lord," Br. 10525 (cf. also Br. 10535="the god Marduk"); *rubā* "prince," Br. 10547 *passim*, (cf. *ku*="the god *Sin*," Br. 10549); secondary meanings are *tamū* "to adjure," Br. 10555; *tašrītu* "dedication," Br. 10556, and *tēnu* "counsel, wise speech," Br. 10557. The most characteristic meanings of *sal*, on the other hand, are "woman" *zinništu*, Br. 10920, and *uru* "*puḍendum muliebre*," Br. 10919 and 10927 (*sal-la=qalla, mug, sal*). Are we then to assume that *Eme-sal* was a speech peculiar to women as distinct from *Eme-ku*, the language of the lords, or princes, or the speech of wise counsel, i. e. the language of the higher laws and religion? The *Eme-sal* texts are many of them devout hymns like K. 257, showing a high religious tone. Why should these have been in the "women's language," as Haupt names the *Eme-sal*, *Sintfluthbericht* 22f.? It is, of course, possible to cite parallels for a "women's tongue" among other peoples. Thus, the Carib women of the Antilles used a different language from that of their husbands, while the Eskimo women of Greenland to this day have certain distinctive pronunciations (cf. Sayce, *Introd. to the Science of Language*, i. 205). In spite of this fact, however, we find no allusions in the Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions to such a state of affairs, which could only arise among very primitive peoples accustomed to long hunting trips, during which the women were necessarily separated from the men for months at a time. We must suppose that so soon as a higher civilization prevailed, as was the case in the very earliest days in the Euphrates valley, such a sexual speech-differentiation would disappear within a single generation. On this account I cannot think that the sex of the original speakers of *Eme-ku* and *Eme-sal* had anything to do with the nomenclature of these idioms.

It is much more probable that *Eme-ku* "language of the lords" or "princes" or "language of counsel," and *Eme-sal* "tongue of the women" were applied to the respective speech-forms in a purely metaphorical sense at a comparatively late date. I suggest that *Eme-ku* "the noble tongue" was so

called owing to its stronger system of phonetics, and that *Eme-sal* "the womanly speech" simply alluded to the softer intonations of this dialect, which, for example, avoided the hard *g*-sound as much as possible, changing it to *m*, *b* and *d*. The *Eme-sal* also preferred the umlaut *ē* to *u*, changed *z* to *š*, *s* to *z*, and *n* to *l*, etc. (see Haupt's masterly treatment of this subject, HT. 134, 2.). It was no doubt owing to its phonetic softness that the ES. dialect seemed to the early Babylonian scribes especially suitable for penitential hymns.

In the meantime, until further light comes to us from the monuments, I fully concur with Weissbach, *op. cit.*, p. 177, that the dialectic non-Semitic *Eme-sal* should simply bear this name and not any term which commits us to a definite theory. Any tribal or geographical distinction between *Eme-ku* and *Eme-sal* has yet to be discovered. The equation *Eme-ku* = *lišān Šumeri* "the language of Šumer" or Babylonia, does not imply that *Eme-sal* was not also spoken in Šumer!

At first sight the subject matter of K. 257 would seem to indicate that the goddess *Bēlit*, to whose praise the hymn is devoted, was a bi-sexual deity. In 22-24 obv., she is made to exclaim: "I am *Bēl* (*Enlillā*) and *Bēlit* (*Ninlillā*)." So the Assyrian line 24, which seems to me to give the correct translation of the Sum. in 22 (see Commentary on this passage). Professor Barton in the JBL. xx. pp. 23/4 gives two examples of what might be regarded as parallel cases; that of the west Semitic deities *Melek-Astart* and *Eshmun-Astart*, whom he considers to be composite gods of both sexes. On the other hand, a closer examination of K. 257 shows that such a supposition with regard to our inscription is unnecessary, as our goddess is simply claiming universality. She calls herself in this hymn the daughter of *Bēl*, 20 and 72 obv., the daughter of *Sin*, 73/4 obv. and the consort of *Ea*, 75 obv., although *Bēlit* is usually known as the consort of *Bēl* (see below and Jastrow, *Religion*, 226). There can be little doubt that there was no fixed mythological conception regarding the relation of *Bēlit* to the pantheon, as the Assyrians also knew her, both as the wife of their peculiar god *Ašur*, and as the mate of *Ea*, as whose spouse she is mentioned in our hymn (cf. Sarg. Cyl. 48 and the parallel, Lyon, *Sargontexte*, p. 71). She was also called by the Assyrians *bēlit ilāni* "the mistress of the gods" (so also in K. 257,

12/13, obv.). A great deal of the confusion with regard to *Bēlit* no doubt arose from the fact that *bēltu* meant "lady," and hence was applicable to any goddess.

By far the most curious part of our inscription are the passages describing the destructive power of *Bēlit*, 25-34 obv. She is evidently at war with and conquers other gods "of the mountain," 45/6 obv., i. e. of the Babylonian universe, and it is distinctly stated, 57/8 obv., that she makes war in heaven. In the reverse 11-22, the same idea is expressed that she is the all-powerful destructive influence who not only overthrows the gods, but also rebellious humanity. From 1 obv.-22 rev. the whole tone of the hymn is that of a song of praise to a warrior goddess. The lines 23-30 rev., which allude to metals, are too mutilated to interpret consecutively, but they seem to imply her power over the inanimate world as well, no doubt in her capacity as a fire deity, as she is expressly stated to be in 11/12 rev.

From 31-72 rev., another phase of *Bēlit's* power is treated, although unfortunately in a very fragmentary text. Here the goddess undoubtedly appears as the patroness of sexual intercourse and parturition. The allusions to "the girl" (31/2) and "the man" (33/4), and to "the man and the woman" (47/54 rev.), taken in connection with the significant expressions "to open the house" (55/6 rev.), and "not to open the house" (57/8 rev.), and "the virgin" (?) in 59/60, show very plainly the general sense of this part of the hymn. *Bēlit* controls the personal attraction of one sex to the other; she presides at the opening of the house, i. e. the act of copulation; she brings forth "the strength out of the house," 61/2 rev., viz., the *semen hominis* and "as the (divine) wife" regulates the passions of the male (67-70 rev.). Finally, 72-73 rev., she ordains the time of birth for the expectant mother.

There can be no doubt as to the composite character of the goddess of this hymn. She is the old *Bēlit* of the earlier Babylonian conceptions, as may be seen from her association with "the mountain." The Babylonian *Bēlit* or *Nintilla* was called *Ninšar-sag* "lady of the mountain," because *Bēl*, her husband, as the chief of the gods, was especially associated with this "mountain of the lands" (see Jastrow, *op. cit.* 55/6). The goddess of our inscription is not only this *Bēlit*, but also *Ištar*

in her double personality of the goddess of battle and the goddess of sexual love. This fact is emphasized by her calling herself "the daughter of *Sin*," who was the father of the real *Ištar*. The warlike *Ištar* is not an Assyrian concept, but goes back as far as the time of *Hammurabi* (KB. iii. 1, 113). *Ištar* in the *Gilgameš-Epic*, as is well known, is a raging deity who smites her foes with plagues. The destructive characteristics of our *Bēlit*, set forth 11 ff. rev., are precisely those of the *Ištar* of the *Gilgameš-Epic*. *Ištar* was, of course, the mother of all mankind and the goddess of sexual love and parturition. I might add also that *Bēlit* in this inscription assumes to herself the attributes of *Gibil*, the fire-god; cf. 11 ff. rev.

Here we must note a very important point. In one Assyrian passage, Rassam Cyl. B. col. v., 17, *Ištar* is called the daughter of *Bēl*, and Jastrow (*Religion*, 205, n. 3) thinks that this must be a textual error. But this statement is characteristic of our present inscription, as I have mentioned already. The four times repeated assertion of K. 257 that *Nin-lil* is the "daughter of *Bēl*," 14/5; 18/9; 71/2; 73/4 obv., shows definitely that this idea must have been one of the variant conceptions, although not a usual one, regarding the parentage of this goddess, and moreover confirms the parallel in the Rassam Cylinder just cited.

The confusion of the original Babylonian *Bēlit* with *Ištar* is well known and need excite little remark (see Jastrow, *Rel.*, 226 ff). The most extraordinary feature of the hymn, K. 257, is the warfare of the goddess *Bēlit* with "the gods of the mountain," 43 obv. I can find no parallel for this statement in the other cuneiform literature except in the tales of the early cosmology, where the feminine *Tiāmat* fights unsuccessfully with the great gods under *Bēl-Marduk*. I am therefore inclined to think that the rebellious "goddess of the water," 53/4 obv., whom *Bēlit* subdues may be a confused later allusion to the *Tiāmat*-myth (?). The goddess's statement, 37/8 obv., that she "washes her hands at the mountain spring of Dilmun," probably an island near Bahrein in the Persian Gulf, serves still further to establish her connection with southern Babylonia.

To sum up, we should note the following points in this connection. 1. We have here a composite deity. The old Babylonian *Bēlit*, associated with the Persian Gulf, fights with

certain gods of the mountain, which is perhaps here a reference to the abode of the primitive chaotic deities who sided with *Tiāmat*, although such a usage is surprising. This is clearly a case of absorption by the feminine *Bēlit* of the chief characteristics of *Bēl-Marduk*! This *Bēlit* is also *Ištar* in both her forms as shown above and the fire-god *Gibil*. 2. The inscription was perhaps of Assyrian origin, judging from the fact that *Bēlit* is called the daughter of *Bēl*, a genealogical assertion which appears, so far as I am aware, only in the Rassam Cylinder cited above. On the other hand, this genealogy of *Bēlit* may have been of Babylonian origin.

Finally, the universal characteristics and dominion claimed by our *Bēlit* are worthy of attention. She is not only *Bēlit*, but also *Bēl*. She is not only the daughter of *Bēl*, but also of *Sin*, 73/4 obv., and the consort of *Ea*, 75/6 obv. She is destructive and at the same time productive. She is the flaming fire of death and the fosterer of love and birth. Nowhere do we find a better example than here of henotheism merging into monotheism. The inscription is worthy to stand among the best efforts of the ancient Assyro-Babylonian hymnologists.

HT. p. 126. Nr. 21 (K. 257).

OBVERSE.

1. . . . . *be-lit* . . . .
2. . . . . me-(e-nu-mên) . . . .
3. (*be-il-*) *tum* (*ul ana-ku-u*)
4. . . . . me-(e-nu-mên)
5. (*be-il-*) *tum* (*ul ana-ku-u*)
6. . . . . me-e-(nu-mên)
7. (*ru-*)*ba-tum* (*ul ana-ku-u*)
8. . . . . me-e-nu-(mên)
9. *ru-ba-tum* (*ul ana-ku-u*)
10. . . . . me-e-nu-(mên)
11. *be-il-tum* *ûu* . . . . (*ul ana-ku-u*)
12. (dim-)me-ir-e-ne me-e-nu-(mên umun-e-ne)
13. (*ilāni ul ana-ku-u*) *be-lit-(šu-nu)*.
14. (me-e-nu-)mên *tu-mu* <sup>dim</sup>mêr *Mu-ul-lil-lá*
15. *ul ana-ku-u mar-ti* *ûu* 𐎶𐎶.
16. umun-mên me-nu-mên me-e *tu-mu-sag*



17. *be-ili-ku ul ana-ku-u ana-ku qar-ra-(du).*
18. *umun-an-na-mên me-e-nu-mên tu-mu ur-sag dimmêr Mu-ul-(lil-lá)*
19. *iš-ta-ri-tum ul ana-ku-u mar-tum qa-rit-um* <sup>ûu</sup> *¶ ana-ku.*
20. *tu-mu mug (?) -sag-gá dimmêr Mu-ul-lil-lá*
21. *mar-tum a-ša-rit-tum ša* <sup>ûu</sup> *¶ ana-ku.*
22. *dimmêr En-lil-lá-mên dimmêr Nin-lil-lá*
23. <sup>ûu</sup> *En-lil ana-ku ša* <sup>ûu</sup> *Nin-lil.*
24. *(ûu En-lil-ku) u* <sup>ûu</sup> *Nin-lil.*
25. *a lú-lú-a-mu nu-si-gi*
26. *me-e ad-dal-xu ul i-zak-ku-u.*
27. *bíl êl-la-mu nu-te-en*
28. *i-ša-tu uš-tax-xa-zu ul i-bi-el-li*
29. *é-an-na é-ki-a šu-mu-ta-ni (in-si-si)*
30. *Ē-a-a-ak-e-dimmêr-ti ana qa-ti-ia u-ma-al-(li).*
31. *êri êr-ra-mu sag an-ku nu-el*
32. *a-li aš-tal-lum ri-is-su ul in-na-aš-(ši)*
33. *e-ne-am-max dug-ga-mu ki-bal-a-ni gúl*
34. *a-mat ki-bi-ti-ia gir-tum mât nu-kur-tum qa-tum u-ab-bat.*
35. *tulbur kur-ra-kit im-gé-nu im-mi-mêr*
36. *ina bur-ti ša-di-i qa-du-tu am-xu-ux.*
37. *tulbur kur ni-tuk-ki-ka sag-ga a-ba-ni-in-(lax)*
38. *ina bur-ti ša-di-i Dil-mun qa-qa-du am-si.*
39. <sup>i</sup> *e-gi-zag-ga-ka zag sal ú-ba-ni-in-(dug-ga)*
40. *ina i-gi-za-an-gi-e uk-ta-an-ni.*
41. *umun-mên šab-šab-ba gu (ka) ú-ba-ni-in-(dê)*
42. *be-ili-ku ina qab-lu a-ša-as-si-ma.*
43. *šab kur-ra-kit gu(ka) u-ba-ni-in-(dê)*
44. *ina qa-bal ša-di-i a-(ša-as-si-ma).*
45. *dim-me-ir kur-ra ni-gíl-li-ag-gi*
46. *iláni ša ša-di-i it-ta-na-an-gi-ri-(ni)*
47. *xar-ra-an kur-ra dim-me-ir kur-ra i-de-mu-ku in-dib-bi*
48. *ina u-ru-ux ša-di-i iláni ša ša-di-i ana-max-ri-ia i-ba-(u).*
49. *bar-bara-ga-(e)-ne mu-un-da-ab-síg-síg-gi*
50. *a-šib pa-rak-ki i-ru-bu-u-ni; i-xi-šu-ni; i-nar-ru-du-nim-(ma).*
51. *bar-bara-( )-uš aš-a-an mu-un-da-láx-láx-e*
52. *a-šib pa-rak-ki kib-sa iš-ten i-ri-id-du-ni; ša-(xu-tu) ?*
53. *mulu lul ni-me a mu-un-na-ab-bi-e*

54. *ša sar-rat mi i-qab-bu-ni.*  
 55. *umun-mên mu-lu lul-la é-a mi-ni-ib-tu(ri)*  
 56. *be-li-ku sa-ar-tu ana bīti u-še-ir-ri-ib.*  
 57. *šu-êl-la-mu an-na ba-na-ab-e-(UŠ=TIL) . . .*  
 58. *ni-iš qa-ti-ia šam-e e-mid e-mu-qa-a-a ša-qa-tu šam-e im-da(xa-çu).*  
 59. *umun-mên šu-mu-ta šu di-a nu-ma-(al)*  
 60. *be-ili-ku it-ti qa-ti-ia qātu ša iš-ša-an-na-nu ul i-ba-aš-ši.*  
 61. *me-ri êl-la-mu ki-a ba-e-til*  
 62. *(tal-lak-tum) ša-qu-tum ir-çi-ti gam-rat.*  
 63. *umun-mên (me-ri)-mu-ta me-ri di-a nu-ma-al*  
 64. *be-ili-ku it-ti še-pi-ia še-pu ša iš-ša-an-(nu-na) ul i-ba-aš-ši.*  
 65. *i-de-mu-ka a-ba-a-an bar-mu-ku a-ba-a-an*  
 66. *ina pa-ni-ia man-nu ina ar-ki-ia ma-an-nu.*  
 67. *(idê)-ku êl-la-(mu) a-ba ba-ra-(ê)*  
 68. *ina ni-iš i-ni-ia man-nu uç-çu*  
 69. *(in-)du-mu a-ba ba-ra-šub-bu*  
 70. *ina (pi-it pu-)ri-di-ia man-nu ip-pa-raš-šid.*  
 71. *ṭumu-max di-da dimmēr Mu-ul-lil-lá me-en*  
 72. *mar-tum (çir-tum di-ni) ša ū ana-ku.*  
 73. *gal-(di) a-a-mu dimmēr En-zu-na me-en*  
 74. *ti-iz-(qar-)tum a-bi-ia ū Sin ana-ku.*  
 75. *umun-mên sal-dug-ga dimmēr Nu-dim-mud-da me-en*  
 76. *be-ili-ku (tak-)nit ū ana-ku.*  
 77. *xi-bi-eš-šu el ú mu-un-el-la.*  
 78. *(e-na) a-na-aš-si (la-bi-)ra a-na-aš-ši.*

## REVERSE.

1. *(lugal-)ra êl-la-mu-un-na-ab-êl-la*  
 2. *šar-ra a-ta-a u-ša-aš-ši.*  
 3. *siba-ra-mù-mên xi-bi mu-un-na-ab-ši-ám-má*  
 4. *xi-bi-eš-šu a-nam-din.*  
 5. *sa-a i-de-mên sa-a a-ba-mên*  
 6. *li-max-ru ana-ku li ar-ku ana-ku.*  
 7. *umun-mên sa-par-max xi-bi líl-lá šu-ru-na-mên*  
 8. *be-ili-ku (sa-par-)ra çi-i-ri ina çi-e-ri za-qi-qi šur-bu-ça-at ana-ku.*  
 9. *sa-(par gíl)li an-na-(edin-na) xi-bi . . . -lá mên.*  
 10. *(šētu it-qur-)tum ša ina çi-rim xi-bi-eš-šu . . . -at ana-ku.*  
 11. *bíl sar-sar-da êl xi-bi-eš-šu lá mên*

12. *i-ša-tum na-pi-iṣ-tum šit-bu-tum ana-ku.*
13. *bíl sar-sar-da kur-ra-ga ba-sig-kab-du-ga mên*
14. *i-ša-tum na-pi-iṣ-tum ša ina ki-rib šad-i iš-ša-ra-pu ana-ku.*
15. *ú-bu-bu ʔe-tal-la ki-bal-a šek-má-mên*
16. *ša nap-lu-ša mut-tab-ri-tum ana mât nu-kur-ti iz-za-nu-nu ana-ku.*
17. *šul ka-tar-ra-ra ka-a-šu ne-mên*
18. *ša id-lu mud-dal-lum pa-si-sat pi-šu ana-ku.*
19. *me-ri-an-šu-êl-la ki-a dib-dib-bi mên*
20. *ša tal-lak-ta-šu ša-qa-tum mu-gas-si-is-su ana-ku.*
21. *gaba-úr-ga- ( )-ra xarran nu-ši-ám-má*
22. *(ša) xa-mi-im i-ra-a-tum ur-xa ul a-nam-(din).*
23. . . . . *ám-u mên ám-má zabar-ra*
24. . . . . *-šu a-na-ku ana-ku a-na-ak si-par-ri . . . .*
25. . . . . *-par-ku ša-qu-tum ana-ku ša-qu-tum na-mir-(tum) ana-ku.*
26. . . . . *mên am-u mên lu-má-dú-dú*
27. *(umun-)an-na mên am-u mên . . . . dú-dú*
28. *úu iš-ta-ri-tum ana-ku . . . . ri-iḅ.*
29. *ám-u zabar-ra . . . .*
30. *a-na-ak si-par-ri ša ana . . . .*
31. *gí-in-bi ú-um-tag-ga . . . .*
32. *am-ta a-la-ap-pat-ma am-ta u . . . .*
33. *mu-lu-bi ú-um-tag-ga . . . .*
34. *a-me-lu a-lap-pat-ma a-(me-la) . . . .*
35. *é mu-un-tu-ri-en-na-mu (é mulu ʔi-ib-mar) . . . .*
36. *bíti e-ter-bu bit a-mi-lí e-da-(ab) . . . .*
37. *mu-lu a-an (da?) mar-en-na-mu . . . .*
38. *a-mi-el iṣ-ti-šu-šu; iṣ-taš . . . .*
39. *i-de-ku al-dim . . . .*
40. *ina maṣ-ri al-lak-ma . . . .*
41. *a-ba-ku al-di-di . . . .*
42. *ar-ki al-lak-ma mu-da- . . . .*
43. *zi-da kab-bu-ku ni- . . . .*
44. *im-na ana šu-(me-lí) . . . .*
45. *kab-bu zi-da-ku ni- . . . .*
46. *šu-me-(lí) (ana) im-ni*
47. *mu-tin 𐎶 -mu-(tin)-a-ku mu-ni- . . . .*
48. *zi-ka-ri (ana) zin-niš-tum . . . .*

49. nu- 𐎢𐎵 -mu-tin-a-ku nu-ni- . . . .  
 50. zin-niš-tum ana zi-(ka)-ri . . . .  
 51. mu-tin nu- 𐎢𐎵 -a-ku se-ir-ka . . . .  
 52. ša zi-ka-ri ana zin-niš-tum . . . .  
 53. nu- 𐎢𐎵 -mu-tin-a-ku se-ir-ka . . . .  
 54. zin-niš-tum ana zi-ka-ri . . . .  
 55. e-ma (gál)-la é xi-bi  
 56. (bītu) pi-ti-i . . . .  
 57. é nu-ma-(gal)-la sar-da- . . . .  
 58. bītu la pi-ti-i . . . .  
 59. dim-me ma-má-a . . . .  
 60. u-diš-ti . . . .  
 61. xi-bi-eš -ši é-ta im-ta-an-(è)  
 62. e-muq-tum iš-tu bi-it u-še-iç-ça-(a)  
 63. me-e dam-dam-ta mu-un-na-ab- . . . .  
 64. ana-ku aš-ša-tu . . . .  
 65. umun-mên tumu ama-da mu-un-na-ab- . . . .  
 66. be-ili-ku mar-ti it-ti um-mi-šu da-ga- . . . .  
 67. gud-gud-đu GIŠ-I-?-BI . . . .  
 68. ša u-ru e-lu-ti . . . .  
 69. . . . -da BAD-?-BI . . . .  
 70. ša u-ru šap-lu-(ti) . . . .  
 71. . . . ŠU-LU-ŠU-AN  
 72. sa par-ri-is-ku ar-(ka lu i-ši [?])  
 73. ú-bi ama sux-a-bi (ka mu-un-na-ab-dê[?])

## TRANSLATION.

## OVERSE.

1. the lady of  
 2/3. (am I not the lady?)  
 4/5. (am I not the lady?)  
 6/7. (am I not the great one?)  
 8/9. (am I not) the great one?  
 10/11. the lady, the god . . . . (am I not?)  
 12/13. (of the) gods am I not (their lady?)  
 14/15. Am I not the daughter of *Bēl*?  
 16/17. I am supreme, am I not? I am the warrior (masc.).  
 18/19. Am I not the goddess? The war-like daughter of  
*Bēl* am I.

- 20/21. The high-placed daughter of *Bel* am I.  
 22. I am *En-lil-lá*, *Nin-lil-lá*,  
 23. (I am *En-lil*) of *Nin-lil*.  
 24. (I am *En-lil*) and *Nin-lil*.  
 25/26. The waters which I stir up do not become clear.  
 27/28. The fire which I kindle does not go out.  
 29/30. The House of Heaven, the House of Earth, unto my hand he has entrusted.  
 31/32. The city which I plunder is not restored.  
 33/34. The utterance of my exalted command destroys the land of the foe. (Assyr. At the utterance . . . [my] hand destroys, etc.).  
 35/36. At the mountain spring I fill the vessel.  
 37/38. At the mountain spring of Dilmun I wash (my) head.  
 39/40. By the *igizangi* stone I am guarded.  
 41/42. I am supreme. In the midst I shout my war-cry;  
 43/44. In the midst of the mountain I shout my war-cry.  
 45/46. The gods of the mountain are hostilely inclined.  
 47/48. On the road of the mountain, the gods of the mountain approach me with hostile intent.  
 49/50. The royal beings (dwellers in palaces) enter before me: hasten unto me: they afflict me.  
 51/52. The dwellers in the palaces with one accord come down unto me.  
 53/54. The rebellious goddess of the water shouts at me.  
 55/56. I am supreme. I will cause the rebellious goddess to enter the house.  
 57/58. I establish the lifting up of my hands to heaven; my exalted powers make war in heaven.  
 59/60. I am supreme. The hand of him who vies with me shall not stand with my hand.  
 61/62. My mighty pace fills the earth.  
 63/64. I am supreme. The foot of him who vies with me shall not stand with my foot.  
 65/66. Who is there before me? Who is there behind me?  
 67/68. From the lifting up of mine eyes who can escape?  
 69/70. From the rush of my onslaught who can flee?  
 71/72. The exalted daughter of the judgment of *Bél* I am.  
 73/74. The noble heroine of my father *Sin* I am.  
 75/76. I am supreme. The duly appointed spouse (?) of *Ea* I am.

77/78. Him who is bowed down I lift up; the aged one I lift up.

## REVERSE.

1/2. Verily, I will raise up the king.

3/4. To my shepherd . . . . I will give.

5/6. Verily, I am before; verily, I am behind.

7/8. I am supreme. An exalted net spread out in the wilderness (field of the storm-wind) I am.

9/10. ? ? ? which in the field (is spread) I am.

11/12. A glowing fire flaming forth I am.

13/14. A glowing fire which burns in the midst of the mountains I am.

15/16. I am the one who, full to overflowing with its flame, rains down on the foeman's land.

17/18. The one who makes as naught the speech of the humbled warrior I am.

19/20. The one who cuts off him whose way is haughty in the land I am.

21/22. To those who store up proud thoughts (?) I give not the way (do not permit to advance with impunity).

23/24. . . . lead I am. Lead alloyed with copper (I am).

25. The lofty . . . . I am. The lofty one, the glowing one I am.

26. Lead I am. The maker (?) of . . . . (I am).

27/28. I am the goddess who . . . .

29/30. Lead alloyed with copper, which unto . . . .

31/32. The girl I disturb, the girl and . . . .

33/34. The man I disturb, the (man) . . . .

35/36. The house which I enter, the house of the man I trouble.

37/38. the man who ? ? ? ?

39/40. I will go before . . . .

41/42. I will go behind . . . .

43/44. Right to left . . . .

45/46. Left to right . . . .

47/48. The man unto the woman . . . .

49/50. The woman unto the man . . . .

51/52. That which the man unto the woman . . . .

53/54. The woman unto the man . . . .

55/56. To open the house . . . .

57. Not to open the house . . . .

59/60. The virgin (?) . . . .

61/62. The strength out of the house I bring forth.

63/64. I as the wife . . . .

65/66. I am supreme. The daughter with her mother I . . . .

67/68. The one who the erect member . . . .

69/70. The one who the low member . . . .

71/72. That which I have planned (in future shall come to pass).

73. On that day (?) to the mother I foretell her time . . . .  
(i. e. of her bearing).

## COMMENTARY.

### OBVERSE.

I have supplied the first fourteen lines from the context of the subsequent text.

14/15. *Ul anakú* with interrogative final *-u* is a question "am I not?"; cf. Delitzsch, *Gr.* § 79 γ; Hommel,<sup>1</sup> *Semiten*, p. 505 *ad* p. 95; HAS., p. xxxix, B. *dimmêr Mullillá*, clearly an assimilation for *Munlillá* which is the well known ES. form for EK. *atngir Enlillá*=*ilu Bél. Enlillá* was evidently pronounced *Illilla*, as is clear from V. 37, 21a and Damasc. Ἰλλίλος (cf. Zb. 19).

16. *Umun*, ES. for *ugun*, V. 37, 34 abc; *u-gu-nu=béltu*. ES. *m* frequently appears for EK. *g*; cf. *gál* (IK)=ES. *ma-al* "to be;" EK. *garza*=ES. *marza* "command" (HT. 134, § 2). There can be no doubt that DU here is a form of writing *mên*, the element of the verb "to be." In Sc. 284, we find *gi-in*=DU=*a-na-ku*, which would seem to indicate the *g* pronunciation for this sign DU; but since ES. frequently avoids the *g*-sound (HT. 134 § 2), it is highly probable that DU in an ES. text must have had the value *mên*=*gin*, Sc. 284; especially as *me-en* occurs in our text, 71, 73, 75 obv.=*anáku*. Haupt has already pointed out that *mên* is not necessarily the first person and the same is undoubtedly true of DU=*gin*, *mên*; cf. AL.<sup>3</sup> 135, 11/12: DU=*atti* "thou" (fem.). DU=*gin* and *mên* may be used for all three persons indiscriminately, the distinctive signs of the

<sup>1</sup> Also p. 507 *ad* p. 292.

first and second persons *mâe* and *zâe* respectively, or the noun suffixes *-mu* "my," *-zu* "thy," being always given, as in AL.<sup>3</sup> 135, 1-5 obv. In the case of our present inscription it may be supposed that a distinctive first personal sign occurred in one of the earlier mutilated lines of the obverse. In *me-nu-mên*, we have a repetition of the stem *me* "to be" which must be the equivalent of the interrogative *-u* in Assyrian.

17. The neg. *-nu-* is infixed as in EK. *giš-nu-un-tuk=ul išmê* "he heard not," V. 24, 38a *et passim*. *Me-e* stands for *anâku*, but it may also be second person, cf. Sfg. 22 *addâmu numea=ul abi atta*. In DL.<sup>3</sup> p. 91, B, *ki-me-ta=ittini* "with us." On *me=me-en*, cf. also ZA. i. 192 and Hommel, *Semiten*, 470, 175.

17. *Bêliku* is a permansive "I am supreme," applicable to either gender. That *nî=îli* is seen Sfg. 61, n. 5. Cf. s. v. 56 obv. *Qarra(du)* masc. is unusual as applied to a goddess; cf. 19 obv. *garittum* and s. v. 22-24 obv.

19. For *ištâritum*, without the god-sign, cf. AL.<sup>3</sup> 134, Ištâr-Psalm, obv. 4. In 27 rev. the word is written with *ihu*. *Qarittum* here is properly feminine; cf. Hwb. 595b.

20. *Mug(?)*-*sag-ga* for *ašâritum* is probably an error. The EK. ideogram is *sag-kal*, *passim*. In ES. we find *i-de-eš-du*, Nbk. ii. 2=*ašâridû*. In *mug(?)*-*sag-ga*, *sag-ga* is no doubt a variant of *zag=ašâridû*, 39, obv. q. v.

22-24. These lines are excessively difficult. The Sum. seems to mean "I am Bêl (and) Bêlit", although the copula is unexpressed. I believe that the Assyr. lines 23-24 are tentative translations on the part of the scribe. L. 23 "I am Bêl of Bêlit" makes apparently no sense. L. 24, however, of which the first part is supplied, probably gives the true rendering (see above Introduction). In 24 *Enlil-ku*, we seem to have an Assyr. perm. form as in *bêliku*, 17. The copula *u* here is perfectly clear.

25. In *lâ-lû-a-mu*, the *-mu* is not necessarily the sign of the first person, although here the context demands the first person. This *-mu* is the sign of the relative clause in Sum. probably indicating all three persons. Cf. IV. 30, 4a: *ursaggal kigim sîggâmu=qarrâdu rabû ša kîma irçitîm retû* "the hero who is as firmly fixed as the earth." Cf. also IV. 27, nr. 1, 4-11, where we find a succession of *-mu* clauses all third person relative. A similar case is seen in HT. 122, obv. 16: *êrizuku*



*aggiggá akámu*=*ana ardiki ša maruštum ibšu* "unto thy (fem.) servant who has sickness. "It is evident, however, that this *-mu* can indicate the first person also, as may be seen from the line under discussion as well as from 27-28 obv.: *bíl éllámu* "the fire which I kindle;" *éri érrámu* "the city which I plunder." This relative participial construction reminds us of Turkish; as *bu gördüğüm kitap dır* "this is the book which I saw." In the Turkic tongues, however, the persons are carefully distinguished by suffixes in these relative participles. Like the Chinese dialects, the Sumerian was lacking in this matter of distinction of the persons, a peculiarity which I hope to discuss in another article (in AJSL., July, 1903, pp. 205 f.).

26. In *addaxu* the relative force is expressed by the overhanging vowel *-u*, as in 28; 30; 32 obv. (*-um* in 32 obv.).

27/28. The root *el* really means "lift up," i. e. "raise a fire." With *te-en*=*balá*, cf. Hammurab. Biling. 9/10; *tenten*=*bullá* "to extinguish"; *bíl téntén*=*kabásu ša išáti* "tread down, extinguish, said of fire," II. 27, 48g. *Téntén* also means *pašáxu* "soothe, pacify," II. 26, 19c. There seems to be an intentional assonance in *bíl éllámu* and in the following *éri érrámu*. L. 28 is cited Zb. 26, 5; cf. ZK. i. 313, n. 2.

29. *Šumutani* "in my hand." Here for the first time we have an unmistakable first personal suffix; i. e. *-mu*. The suffixes *-ta* and *-ni* here have both of them postpositional force=Assyr. *ina*; cf. IV. 25, 40 a: *ki-azag-ga-ni-ku*=*ana ašar télilti*; ib. 42a: *ki-él-la-a-ni*=*ana ašar télilti* "unto a pure place," where *-ni* is equivalent to *ana*. I supply *in-si-si*=*umalli* (cf. Hwb. 410).

30. There is an unusual difference between this passage and the text of 29 obv. In 29, *é-an-na é-ki-a* can only mean "the house of heaven (and) the house of earth," i. e. the entire universe as understood by the Babylonians. In *é-a-a-ak-e-dim-mēr-ti*, 30, the combination *a-ak* must be a scribal error for *id*=*náru* "river," Br. 11647. The whole probably means "the house of the water of the river, the house of the god of life" (*ti*=*balátu*, Br. 1647). This expression is unique here. It is really an inversion of the expression in 29, i. e. "the house of heaven," 29="the house of the god of life," 30, and "the house of earth," 29="the house of the water of the river," 30. It is perfectly evident that the Assyr. scribe regarded the expression in 30 as being synonymous with that in 29.

31. *Ēri* seems to be ES. for EK. *āru*=*ālu*; cf. Sa. 3, 11 and Sfg. 61, n. 4. *Ēr* is ES. for *šalālu*, Br. 5388. The usual EK. form is *lax*, Br. 4948. DU (*tum*) also=*šalālu*, Br. 4948 in EK. Note that the Sum. line here has *an-ku* "unto heaven," which is not represented in Assyrian by *ana šamē*. In *aštallum*, the overhanging relative vowel is *-um* instead of *-u*; cf. on 26 obv.

33/4. *E-ne-ām*=*amātu* in a number of passages, cited Br. 5871. It is undoubtedly a dialectic writing for *ka=inim* (EK.) as pointed out in ZA. i. 9. The extraordinary and unnecessary *qātum* "(my) hand" of 34 is not represented in the Sum. text.

35/6. The value *tulbur* for this sign is found II. 32, 16g; cf. Zb. 105. It has also the value *pu*; see LTP. nr. 211 and for *bāru*, cf. *ib.* 169, n. i. The fem. *būrtu* in 36 is an unusual form for *bāru* "well"=Sum. *tulbur*, *pu*. I am forced to read *-nu* as a component part of *im-gé=qadātu* "an earthen vessel;" cf. V. 32, 26a; *im-gé(gu)=qa-du-tum=ṭītu* "clay," not *didu*, as Br. 8401; also V. 27, 7a. *Nu* in our passages may mean *ṣalmu* "black," Br. 1963, but this is doubtful. For the ES. value *ge* (EK. *gu*), cf. Sfg. 51. *Mēr*, ES. for *gīr=maxāxu* only here. For *im-mi*, first person, cf. IV. 6, 45b: *im-min-ri=armēma*. The prefix *im-*, like a number of other Sum. verb prefixes, may indicate all three persons indiscriminately.

37/8. *Tulbur kur Nitukkika* "at the mountain spring of Dilmun" (*-ka* here=*ina*): cf. 39 and 65 obv. (also Br. 551). It is probable that *-ka* here serves the double purpose of the postposition and of the genitive case. It is evidently cognitive with *-ku*, *-kit*, the latter probably to be read *ke*, or *ge*. *Ka* also indicates the genitive relation in archaic Sumerian. I supply *lax=misū* "wash," Sb. 76. *A-ba* is unusual in an indicative sense; cf. only Br. 6331: *aba-nib-gigi-eš=uttirru* and Br. 3571: *sagsar aba-šin-na-ak=itta'idma*. It may appear as an imper. of the second or third person; cf. *aba-nin-sar=rukusma*, Br. 4331; *aba-nin-gub=lizziz*, HT. 98, 49. In these latter cases, however, it is probably a variant of the optat. *xaba*. *Aba* usually means *mannu* "who?" See below 69/70 obv.

39/40. *igizagga=igizangu*, found only here, may mean "the stone (*i*) of the pen (*gi*) of fate" (*zangu=zag=pirištu*, V. 29, 73a). *Zag* here must mean *ašārīttu*, fem. of *ašāridu* "first in rank," although it is not expressed in Assyrian. *Zag=ašāridu*, V. 29, 64a. The *-ka* in *igizagga-ka=ina*, as in 37 obv. The

allusion may be to some sacred written tablet, but the meaning is very obscure. *Uktanni* must be Iftaal of  $\sqrt{\text{כנה}}$ , as is evident from *sal*, which must be part of the following verb, i. e. *sal-dug-ga*, II. 35, 45c. *Kunnû* means "guard, preserve;" cf. Br. 533. Our own inscription 75 obv. has the same combination *taknîtu*.

41/2. *Šab-šab-ba=qablu* "midst" only here in reduplicated form; cf. on 43, obv. *Qablu* in this passage cannot mean "battle," as it is probably a variant for *ša-ba=libbu*, IV. 11, 15b; 20, 5. Cf. 43 obv. *Gu(ka)-dē* is well known for *šasû*. This line is merely a poetical prolepsis of 43 obv. as in the case with 45/6 obv.

43/4. Here the meaning of *šab* is perfectly clear. L. 43 is the complement of 41.

45/6. *Ni-gil-li-ág-gi*. This text seems reasonably certain. *Gil* in V. 16, 71c appears as equivalent to *ga-ru*[ ]. This must be *ga-ru-u* "to be hostilely inclined;" cf. *garû*, *girû* "enemy." I cannot explain the ending *-ág-gi*. *Ittanangiri(ni)*, therefore, is probably Iftaneal form from *garû*. This passage, then, like 41/2, is simply a prolepsis of 47/8.

47/8. *Xarran* is a variant, perhaps ES. for EK. *kaskal=var-ránu* "road," Sb. 78. The Sum. phonetic writing *xar-ra-an* is found also II. 38, 23c; V. 26, 2g, *xarránu*; and IV. 20, nr. i, obv. 12; II. 38, 24c=*urxu* "way." We must, I think, regard Sum. *xarran* as a Semitic loanword from *xarránu*, which appears to be a derivative from *xaráru* "dig, hollow out" (cf. *xurru* "hole"; *xarru* "canal"). A parallel instance is *sáqu* "street" from *sáqu* "to be narrow," or transitive, "narrow down;" cf. Sfg. 9, n. 4. *Idē* is, of course, ES. for *igē*, HT. 134; cf. 65 obv. The suffix *-ku=ana*; in 65 obv. it represents *ina*.

49. *Bar* here must be *āšib*; cf. Br. 6875; *bara* is undoubtedly *parakku*, Sb. 354, of which *-ga* is probably phonetic complement. *E-ne*="those who."

50. The Assyrian translator is doubtful here, with respect to the correct rendering of *šig* (PA, 49), as he gives three variant versions; viz., "they enter before me;" "they hasten unto me;" "they afflict me," of which the latter seems to me the best, as the context plainly shows the hostile intent of the gods. For *šig=narādu*, cf. Br. 5583.

51/2. The break after *bar-bara* is not large enough to contain *e-ne* as in 49. *UŠ aš-a-an* is plainly *kibsa ištēn* “(with) a single tread.” *Uš=kabāsu*, Br. 5036, but *kibsu* is generally explained in Sum. by *ki-uš*, II. 27, 50g; V. 19, 52a; IV. 23, 50b. The usual pronunciation of the non-Semitic numeral is *diš*, represented by a single perpendicular wedge; *aš*, the horizontal wedge for “one,” I find only here and IV. 19, 46a. Lehmann, *Šamaššumukin*, p. 128. n. 4, regards the horizontal *aš*-sign as a mere graphical variant for *diš* and considers that “one” was always pronounced *diš*; cf. also Jensen ZA. i. 188. The “gulation” of the perpendicular *diš*, however, has the value *aš* (a perpendicular wedge crossed by three horizontals), which seems to me to confirm the value *aš* for “one” (cf. on the horizontal *aš*, Delitzsch, *Entstehung*, p. 69). The adverbial and verbal *-a-an* should be read *-ám*. *Láx=arādu* only here. The common Sum. form is *dul*, IV. 3, 19/20b. The Assy. *šuxu-(tu)* is very doubtful.

53/4. *Lul=sarru* in several passages; cf. Br. 7275. *Ni-me* I take as a part of the verb “to be” (*mē*) unexpressed in Assyrian. See above on 16 obv. *A* must be the equivalent of Assy. *mī*, probably a defective writing for *mī-e* “water,” Nerigl. ii. 10. That the infix *-nab-* may be used for the first personal object is clear from II. 48, 21gh; *mun-nab-siga=utannišanni* “he weakens me.” It usually appears as the sign of third person, as *-rab-* is the common infix of the second person.

55/56. *Mulu lulla*, lit. “the person who is rebellious.” ES. *mulu*=EK. *gál* (IK.), cf. ZA. i. 193. Neither in 53 nor 55 is there any indication of the fem., which might have been shown by means of *sal*. It is interesting to note that *bēliku* is written here with *li-* instead of *nī=īli*, Sfg. 61, n. 5, as above, *passim*.

57/8. The Sum. line is incomplete, as only the first half of it was written. I supply *tīl=gamāru*; cf. *ba-e-tīl=gamrat*, obv. 61. *Tīl*, however, has the value *uš*, Sb. 223, and *uš=emēdu*, *passim*, Br. 5032, as indicated here *ba-e-(tīl)=ēmid*. I find the prefix *ba-e* only with *tīl* (*uš*); *dirig-dirig=atāru* and *tuš(ku)=ašābu*, so that *tīl* is probably the correct reading here.

59/60. *Sa-a* (DI-*a*)=*šanānu* here and 63 obv. The vocalic complement *-a* leads me to adopt the reading *sa* for DI in this passage; cf. Sa. iii. 36, II. 7, 4e and Br. 9519. The usual Sumerian combination for *šanānu* is *dadi*, cf. Br. 6689, which

seems to be a dissimilative reduplication of DI(?). The simple root DI-a or *sa-a* in 59 is a *ḥāl*-clause=Semitic relative. It is here exactly equivalent in sense to the Turkish relative participle seen in *gidip* "one who goes," only in Turkish the ending *-ip* is necessary. *Ma-(al)* is ordinary ES. (Br. 6811 and 63 obv.) for EK. *gál* (IK), see Br. 5430.

61/2. *Mēri* is ES. for EK. *gír*=*tallaktum*, V. 16, 25ab; cf. also HT. 134 § 2, and below obv. 63. In the Assyrian line 62 the possessive is not expressed in *tallaktum saqātum*, but it appears in Sum. *ellá-mu*. In 62, *gam-mar* is of course *gam-rat*, as Jensen pointed out; *Deutsche Litztg.*, 1891, col. 1451.<sup>1</sup>

63/4. *Mēri* here=*šēpu* "foot"=EK. *gír*; cf. HT. 134, § 2.

65/6. *Idēmuka*; *idé*=EK. *igé*; see on 47 obv.; *-ka* here=*ina*, as in 37, 39, obv. *Aba-ám* (*a-an*)=*mannu*; cf. on 37 obv.; *-ku*=*ina*; cf. on 67 obv.=*ina* and 47 obv.=*ana*.

67/8. The ending *-ku*=*ina*; cf. s. v. 65 obv.

69/70. The Sum. (*in*-)*dumu* which, in spite of the broken text, evidently equals *pít purídia*,<sup>2</sup> 70, is very doubtful; cf. Br. 4236. *Pít purídia* must mean something like "the rush of my onslaught;" cf. the parallel IV. 26, 42a: *ina pít purídika mannu ipparaššid*. In HT. 76, 15, *Nusku* goes to *Ea* in the depths of the abyss *purídu* (adv.). In this latter passage, the Sum. equivalent (EK.) is *gír-pap-xal-la* "with the foot of compulsion;" *papxal*=*pušqu*, Sc. 302. *Gírpapxal* also=*etēqu* "advance, said of an army," IV., 17, 11a and *italluku* "go," Br. 1154. It seems highly probable, therefore, that *purídu*, whose derivation is unknown, must have a similar signification. In our present text the element *du* of (*in*-)*du* may be equivalent to *aláku* "go." The meaning of *in* is obscure, if indeed *in* is the correct reading. *Šub*=*naparšudu* "flee," Br. 1439.

71/2. The EK. form *tur* is written here for *martum*, but it was probably intended to be pronounced *ṭumu* as in 18 obv.; cf. II. 37, 54e *tur*=*du-mu* (i. e. *ṭu-mu*, ZA. i. 19 and II. 48, 33a, Sa. v. 33). *Max* can only mean *ḡirtum* "exalted," while *dida* may be a dissimilative reduplication from *dī*=*dīnu* "judgment;" cf. IV. 2, 3c: *lugal dī-da-kit*=*bél dīni* "lord of judgment" (also Zb. 83). The break in the Assyrian line 72 is quite long enough to admit the restoration *martum* (*ḡirtum dīni*) *ša Bél anáku* "the exalted daughter of the judgment of Bel am I:"

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hwb. p. 199 b.

<sup>2</sup> Suggested also by Haupt.

73/4. *Gal-di=tizqāru*, a form like *ritpāšu=zitqāru*, from *קָר*, the real meaning of which is probably “noble, prominent.” The fem. *tizqārtum* must be assumed in this passage, although it occurs nowhere else. Mr. S. H. Langdon assumes that *ū Sin* here is a scribal error for *ū Bēl*, i. e. that the scribe should have written five corner wedges (50, the symbol of *Bēl*), instead of three (30, the sign of *Sin*; viz., the thirty days of the month). In view of the Sum. *dimmēr Enzuna=Sin* I see no reason to adopt this emendation. Moreover, the fact that the goddess calls herself the daughter of both *Bēl* and *Sin* is quite in accordance with the universality of dominion ascribed to her in the rest of the hymn.

75/6. *Saldugga* can only mean *taknītu* here, cf. II. 35, 46c; IV. 25, 55b, which must signify “a woman taken under one’s protection,” perhaps “spouse” or “concubine;” cf. *kinītu* “maidservant” from this same stem *kunnū*, and perhaps *kinātu* “household retainers,” Hwb. 338. The ending *-nīt* in 76 must be the final of *tak-nīt*. I consider *ri* in *be-ni-ri* in this line to be an error for *-ku*, i. e. *be-ili-ku*, although *ri* is clearly written. *Nu-dim-mud* “the artificer” is of course *Ea*. Here it is well to note the presence of *me-en* for the verb “to be,” in this case = *anāku*; cf. the remarks above on 16 obv.

77/8. Most unfortunately we are confronted with the familiar Assy. *xibiššu* of the scribe “broken off,” a form like *ediššu* from the adv. *xibeš*. The stem is *xipū*. Owing to the Sum. *ū* in the second member and the Assy. *-ra* I read *labīra anašši* as the equivalent of Sum. *munēlla*. *Ū=labīru*, Br. 9465. This makes it impossible that the obscurely written *e-na* of the first member can be *ēnu* “eye.” It must rather be from *enū* “to bow down, oppress,” in parallelism with *labīra* “old.” The Sum. equivalent for *ena* may be *mulū bal*, as in V. 39. 27g, or simply *bal*, as in K. 247, ii. 20, 25. *Él* in the first member is probably *hāl*-phrase for the first *anašši*.

#### REVERSE.

1/2. The reverse seems to continue the sense of 77/8 obv. I supply *lugal* in Sum. = *šar-ra*; cf. IV. 29, 21a, 22a, *lugal=šar*; viz., the sign *nisigū*, Br. 4286. *Élla* is again *hāl*-clause, while *munnabēlla* is the finite form with infixed object *nab* = “him.”

Assyr. *a-ta-a*, not expressed in Sum., must be the adv., *atá* "verily," found in the epistolary literature as a resumptive; cf. Hwb. 156.

3/4. *Siba-ra-mu* "to (*ra*) my (*-mu*) shepherd" (*siba*); *mén*="I am" (?). Then follows a broken passage as indicated by *xibi* (abbrev. for *xibiššu*). *Munnabsiámmá* plainly=*anamdin*. The ending *-ámmá*, ES. for *ággá*, is difficult. *Ám*, Sb. 205, and *ámmá*, V. 25, 22a, are Sum. forms for *madádu* "measure out, apportion." *Šiámmá*, therefore, in our passage and in 21 rev. (*g. v.*) may merely be a sense-reduplication of the idea of *nadánu* "give, convey." This point is, however, by no means clear as yet.

5/6. I find *sa-a*=Assyr. *li* only here. *Aba*=*arku* for *bar* (cf. 65 obv.) is also peculiar to this passage.

7/8. *Sa-par*=Assyr. *sapáru* "net;" cf. Br. 3126. It is probably from a Semitic stem *sapáru* "enclose;" cf. *supáru* "enclosure," Hwb. 509, and the name of the wall *Tábi-supáršu* "its enclosure is good," Zb. 73, n. 2. On the other hand, *sa*=*šétu* "net," Sc. 142, but this may be only accidental. The probability is that the combination *sa-par*=*šétu šuparurtu*, IV. 26, 23a "an arranged (i. e. spread out) net" is a non-Semitic paronomasia on Assyr. *sapáru*. *Edinna*=*ġéri* "field" must have stood in the original text here. *Lil*=*zaqíqi* "storm wind," Sc. 212 and *lilla*=*šáru* "wind," IV. i. col. v. 4/5, 41/2. Here we have *lilla*=*zaqíqu*. *Šuruna* undoubtedly means *šur-buġat*, but only in this passage. It may be ES. for *šar-ra*=*rabaġu* II. 36, 24, 25ab. The *šu-* in *šuruna* is probably not the sign of the Shaphel.

9/10. Prof. Haupt suggests in 10 *itqurtum*. The probability is that it was preceded by *šétu* "net." The Sum. has *sa* and traces of the sign *ġil*=*itqurtu*, K. 246, col. iv. 37, with phonetic complement *-li*, as indicated in the transliteration. Both the derivation and meaning of *itqurtum* are uncertain; see Hwb. 160, but the word is evidently an adjective here qualifying *šétu*, i. e. "some sort of a net which in the field is spread am I." *Edin* should follow *an-na*; cf. *anna-edinna*=*ina ġéri*, IV. 3, 1a. The verb is entirely obliterated except the Assyr. fem. ending *-at.*, but it must have meant "spread."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Line 10 was also discussed by Jensen, ZA. i. 65.

11/12. For *sa*=*napáxu*, see Br. 4327. In 12, *šitbátum* seems to me to be the Ifteal adjective from *tebā* "go forth hostilely," hence my translation.

13/14. *Kur-ra-ga*=*ina kirib šadē* is very curious. We find *an-šá-ga*, K. 4386 col. iii. 56=*kirib šamē*, where *-ga* is merely the phonetic complement of *šá(šága)* "heart, midst." In our passage we expect *šá* or the postposition *-ta* or both; *ga*, however, undoubtedly has the force of *kirib* here. *Ba-sig-kab-du-ga* is evidently the equivalent of *iššarapu*. *Ba-* is of course the verbal prefix; *sig(PA)-ga* appears with *bíl* "fire;" *bíl sig-ga*, II. 34, 70a=*kamū* with *𐎶*, but this must be an inaccurate writing for *gamū*, as *ka* and *ga* are interchangeable. In *sig-kab-du-ga* we clearly have a fuller form of the same combination, but I cannot explain it further. *Sig(PA)*=*namāru* "shine" in one passage, K. 40, col. iv. 1, Br. 5582, which tends to confirm my interpretation of this sign in a combination meaning "burn." *Iššarapu* is probably Ifteal.

15/6. *Ūbubu*, only here, is clearly *muttabritum*. *Ṭetalla*=*napluša* looks like a loanword from Sem. *ṭitallu* "flame." *Ṭe*, however, may be read *bíl* "fire" and undoubtedly suggested this idea to the ancient reader. It was probably not read *bíltal-la* here, as we find *ṭe-tal*=*ṭitallum*, K. 4361, col. i. 4. It is clearly another paronomasia, as in 7/8 rev. *Šek* (*še-ig*)=*a-an*, V. 32, 21a; lit. "water of heaven"=*zanānu* "rain;" *ma* is abbreviated form of *mal* (ES.) "to be." *Muttabritum* is evidently Ifteal of *barū* "be full, sated." *Iazanunu* in HT. is clearly an error for *izzanunu*, ZA. i. 65/6.

17/8. *Šul*=*edlu*, *passim*. *Katarra*=*muddallum* from *dalālu* "be humble" *ka-tar*, IV. 29, 15b; Zb. 73/4. The second *ra* in our text is the postposition *ana*. *Ka-a*=*pīšu*; *šu*=*pasāsu* "destroy" only here, but *šu*=*saxāpu* "overthrow," *passim*, Br. 10839. With *ne-mén*, prefix *ne-* for first person, cf. *nerabbi*=*aqabbi*, IV. 10, 5b *et passim*. For 17 rev. see also Guyard, ZK. i. 97, n. 2.

19/20. In *mērianšūella* we have a repetition: *mēri*=*tallaktum*, see above on 61 obv. *An* and *šūella* both mean high, i. e. *šaqa-tum*. *Ki-a*=*ina ercītīm*, IV. 4, 5b, not expressed in Assyrian. *Dib-dib-bi*=*kamū* "bind," Br. 10683 and *gabātu* "seize," Br. 10694, *passim*. These meanings are closely allied to *muqassisu*=*muqacṣiṣu*, 𐎶𐎶𐎵 "cut off," found only here.



21/2. This is a very difficult passage. *Gaba* undoubtedly signifies *irátum*, probably pl. of *irtu* "breast," *Xamim* must be participle of *xamāmu* "cut, harvest, store up," syn. of *eḡēdu*, because *úr*=*xamānu* in this sense and *not* in the sense "lead, govern." I render tentatively, therefore, bearing the context in mind; *xāmim irátum* "those who store up proud thoughts." *Irtu* means "advances" in the connection *mutir irtišu*, Hwb. 125 and may perhaps be construed in this sense. I read *xarran* = *urxu*, following obv. 47 rather than the usual *kaskal*. On *šiámmá*=*nadānu*, cf. s. v. rev. 3.

23/4. *Am-u*=*anāku* "lead" only here. The EK. form is *anna*, *passim*; cf. ES. *ámmá* here, evidently a dialectic variation of EK. *anna*. *Ud-ka-bar*=*zabar*, Sb. 113.

25. From here on the inscription is too badly mutilated to admit of consecutive translation, although the general meaning seems apparent (see above, p. 107). This line which has no Sum. equivalent is evidently an allusion to the glowing of the metals.

26. This is an ES. line without Assy. translation.

27. I supply *umun* here, as in 18 obv. Note that *ištáritum* is written with the determ. *ilu*, but cf. 19 obv.

31. *Gi-in-bi* must be compared with *gi-in*=*amtu*, K. 2759, 10 *et passim*, Br. 2470. The *-bi* suffix is the demonstrative, unexpressed in Assyrian. *Tag*=*lapātu* "turn over, disturb," Br. 3797. It may mean "excite" here; cf. Zb. 12, 5.

33. For *mulu*, also 37 rev., cf. 55 obv.

36. *Muntūri-ēnnāmu*=*etērbu* is relative conjugation with the final *-mu* as above 25 obv. The infix *ēna* occurs also with *-zu*; *garri-ēnnazu*, Br. 11957=*tabšima*. For *ēdab*, pres. of *adābu*, cf. IV. 61, 35b: *ākan šā nakru ša idibakanni* "where is the foe who has troubled thee?" The usual ideogram for *adābu* is EK. XI-GAR=ES. *gi-ib-mar*, Sd. 19.

37/8. I cannot explain this passage. The Sum. *-ennāmu*, as in 35 rev., shows a relative clause.

39. *Dim* would be the ES. value for *gim* in *al-dim*. It is cognitive with *di-di*=*alāku*, 41 rev.

41/2. On *aba* see s. v. rev. 5. *Di-di*, cognitive with *dim*, 39 rev.

47/8. *Mu-tin*=*zikaru* also II. 7, 13c; II. 25, 39a, *et passim*; Br. 1326. *Mutin* is probably ES. for *giš*, *nitax*=*zikaru*; UŠ,

Br. 5048. The combination  $\text{𐎶𐎵}-mu-tin = zinništu$  "woman;" cf.  $nu-\text{𐎶𐎵}-mu-tin$ , 49, 50, 53, rev. *Sal* is, of course, the usual ideogram for *zinništu*. The character  $\text{𐎶𐎵}$  is evidently a variation of the sign *nunuz*, Br. 8177 = *līpu* "offspring, descendant," syn. of *šuršu* =  $\text{שׁרשׁ}$ . The occurrence of this sign in combination with *mu-tin* = *zīkaru* is explicable, but unusual.

55. *Gál* = *pītā*, only IV. 18, 15a; cf. *gal* (IK) - *gál* = *pītā*, Bezold, Lit. 181, n. 1. The *ma-* in *ma-gál-la* in our passage must be the verbal prefix with infinitive force.

59/60. The combination *dim-me ma-má-a* seems like two words representing the Assy. *udištu* from  $\text{חדש}$  "be new, fresh," hence in this connection probably a virgin(?). See comment above, p. 107. It is impossible to determine whether there is any connection of ideas between our *dimme* and *dim-dim-ma* = *dunnamā* "a weakling," II. 28, 68b. *Dim-ma* also = *šarru* "king," V. 16, 52e.

61/2. *Emāqtum* must be fem. abstract for *emāqu* "strength," especially "bodily strength," *passim*, Hwb. 39. The usual ideogram for *emāqu* is ID (*a*), but also *ni-e* (GIR), cf. *s. v.* 58 obv. The mutilated ideogram ending in *-ši* in our present passage (61) is inexplicable. *Ē-ta* = *ištu bīt*; note the construct state.

63/4. On *me-e* = *anāku*, without *-n*, i. e. *mēn*, cf. Haupt's able remarks, Sfg. 31. *Dam-dam* with suffix *-ta* must mean "as a wife."

65/6 *Tur* here must be read *ṭumu*; cf. 14, 20 obv. Note the masc. *-šu* in *ummi-šu*, where we expect *ummi-ša*. This is not uncommon and may be traced to non-Semitic influence.

67/8. With *gud-gud-du* = *elūti*, cf. II. 30, 10g and Br. 4704. The sign for *uru* is *sal* = *qalla*, II. 30, 14-19, but it is broken here. *GĪŠ-I?-BI* is incomprehensible.

69/70. We should perhaps supply (*sal-ki-ta*)-*da* = *uru šaplāti*.

70. I cannot explain ŠU-LU-ŠU-AN. It is probably not equivalent to 72 rev.

72. *Parīsku*, as suggested by Mr. S. H. Langdon, is permissive of *parāsu* "decide."

73. *UD-bi* = *ina āmišumma*, which is not expressed. Mr. Langdon has ingeniously translated this line as I indicate: *sux-a-bi* lit. "her how long;" *sux* = *axulap*, HT. 115, rev. 5. Cf. also Zb. 28 and HT. 122, obv. 12.

The last eleven lines are hopelessly mutilated.

*Eme-sal* forms discussed in the Commentary.

<i>Am-má</i> , 23 rev.	<i>Mén</i> , 16 obv.
<i>Am-u</i> , 3 rev., 23 rev.	<i>Mér</i> , 35 obv.
<i>Ba-síg-kab-du-ga</i> , 13 rev.	<i>Méri</i> , 61 obv.; 19 rev.
<i>Gé</i> , 35, obv.	<i>Mullillá</i> , 14 obv.
<i>Dim</i> , 39 rev.	<i>Mulu</i> , 55 obv.; 33 rev.
<i>Dim-me</i> , 59 rev.	<i>Mu-tin</i> , 47 rev.
<i>Dim-dim-ma</i> , 59 rev.	<i>Nu-dim-mud</i> , 75 obv.
<i>Egizagga</i> , 39 obv.	<i>Nu-𐎶𐎵 -mu-tin</i> , 47 rev.
<i>E-ne-ám</i> , 33 obv.	<i>Sa-a</i> , 59 obv.
<i>Êr</i> , 31 obv.	<i>Sa-a</i> , 5 rev.
<i>Êri</i> , 25 obv.	<i>Šék</i> , 15 rev.
<i>Xarrán</i> , 47 obv.; 21 rev.	<i>Ši-ám-má</i> , 3 rev.
<i>Idé</i> , 47 obv.; 65 rev.	<i>Šu-ru-na</i> , 7 rev.
<i>In-du-mu</i> , 69 obv.	<i>Te-tal-la</i> , 15 rev.
<i>Kur-ra-ga</i> , 13 rev.	<i>Tu-mu</i> , 18, 71 obv.; 61 rev.
<i>Láx</i> , 51 obv.	<i>Ú-bu-bu</i> , 15 rev.
<i>Mal</i> , 16 obv.; 59 rev.	<i>Umun</i> , 16 obv.
<i>Ma-má-a</i> , 59 rev.	𐎶𐎵 -mu-tin, 47 rev.
<i>Marza</i> , 16 obv.	